

## REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on October 5, 2006. Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 1-11 stand rejected. Claims 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,215,982 to Trompower ("Trompower"). Claims 4-6, 8, and 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trompower in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,470,184 to Machida ("Machida"). In light of the above amendments and below remarks, reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In paragraph 1 of Office Action, claims 4 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as failing to set forth the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. The Office Action alleges that "evidence that claim recite 'transmission-reception are pause (suspend) for a time zone in which the communication load is low' fail(s) to correspond in scope to that which Applicant(s) regard as the invention can be found in the specification . . ." According to the Office Action, page 12, lines 1-19 and Figure 7 of the present invention indicate the invention is different from what is defined in the claim because the specification "discloses in which transceiver of the base station's pauses upon load of communication is maximum not low." Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse.

Claim 4 recites "wherein said central processor controls said plural control processors so that prescribed transmission-reception portions are paused for a time zone in which the communication load is low." As explained in the opening of the paragraph cited by the Office Action, beginning on page 11 at line 21, the application states "furthermore, in the night during which the communication load is small, a night-timer is set in CPU and antennas and transmission-reception portions other than

one antenna and one transmission-reception portion are paused (suspended) during a predetermined period as shown in the flow chart of Figure 7.” There is nothing in the remainder of that paragraph nor in the following three paragraphs cited by the Office Action that is inconsistent with the claimed recitation that “prescribed transmission-reception portions are paused for a time zone in which the communication load is low” as the exemplary time period in Figure 7 is “in the night during which the communication load is small.” See page 11, lines 21 and 22. Accordingly, Applicants urge that claims 4 and 8, which depends from claim 4, are consistent with the specification of the present application and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Trompower for the reasons given on pages 2-4. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 1 claims a wireless base station and explicitly recites that the base station includes “plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions” and “a central processor for controlling said plural control processors.” In rejecting the two tier processing arrangement of independent claim 1, the Office Action states that “Trompower teaches plural control transmission-reception portion base station 115 with plurality of transceiver and processor (202) of Figs. 2-5, 7-8[.]” Applicants respectfully disagree. It is clear from the disclosure of Trompower, and most specifically from Figure 2, that each base station in Trompower only has one processor 202. Indeed, each of Figures 2, 5, 7, and 8, all cited by the Office Action, show that Trompower’s antenna 125 and auxiliary antenna 129 each are connected to the single processor 202. Trompower does not teach a plurality of control processors for controlling the transceivers for the plurality of antennas as required by

independent claim 1. Trompower expressly teaches a single processor 202 for controlling all of the transceivers. At best, Trompower teaches a single processor connected to plural transmission-reception portions, not plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions as recited in the claim. Accordingly, Trompower does not teach each and every recitation of claim 1, and Applicants respectfully urge reconsideration and withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

As claims 2-3, 7, and 9 each ultimately depend from claim 1, Applicants urge that these claims are in condition for allowance as well and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims on the basis of the above arguments made with respect to independent claim 1.

The Office Action rejects claims 4-6, 8, and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trompower in view of Machida. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 4-6 and 10 each ultimately depend from claim 1. The addition of Machida does not cure the deficiencies of Trompower discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Since the combination of Trompower and Machida does not read on the invention as recited in claims 4-6 and 10, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Similar to independent claim 1, independent claim 11 recites a method requiring an act with respect to “plural control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions . . . .” The Office Action alleges that for claims 4-6 and 11, “Trompower teaches all limitations as explained above and in claim 1, except transceiver pauses time zone in which the communication load is low.” As explained above with respect to independent claim 1, Trompower does not in fact teach plural

Application No. 10/678,232  
Amendment dated January 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of October 5, 2006

Docket No.: Y1929.0097

control processors for controlling said plural transmission-reception portions. Trompower only teaches a single processor 202 for controlling the operation of its plurality of antennas. Nothing in Machida cures the deficiency of Trompower as applied to independent claims 1 and 11 and all of the remaining dependent claims. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 11 on the basis of the combination of Trompower and Machida is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicants urge that all of the claims and hence the entire application is presently in condition for allowance and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: January 5, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Brian M. McGuire/  
Brian M. McGuire  
Registration No.: 55,445  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas  
41st Floor  
New York, New York 10036-2714  
(212) 277-6500  
Attorney for Applicant